

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

FRIDAY, April 24, 1998

Washington Times

April 24, 1998

Pg. 1

NATO skeptics in Senate find voice

Lott says White House neglect endangers expansion pact

By Nancy E. Roman
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Senate opposition to an expansion of the NATO alliance is mounting as lawmakers question the cost and wisdom of defending more fledgling democracies with weak military forces, expansion foes contended yesterday.

Sen. Robert C. Smith, New Hampshire Republican, said NATO expansion would alienate Russia, driving the country toward an alliance with China that could bring on a new Cold War.

"What's the urgency?" he asked of the push to add three Central European countries to the 16-member security alliance. "There is no urgency."

Sen. Tom Harkin, Iowa Democrat and another leading opponent, said yesterday that some 20 senators are undecided or have expressed doubts about enlarging the alliance, and Mr. Smith said the ranks of the skeptics are increasing.

Two-thirds of the Senate — 67 votes if all 100 senators are present — is needed to ratify or revise a

treaty. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, Mississippi Republican, said he expects the measure to pass with about 70 votes.

NATO expansion also has the backing of Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms. The North Carolina Republican is predicting an "overwhelmingly positive" vote.

But Mr. Lott said the White House has been "asleep at the throttle" and said he has told the administration: "If you don't pay attention to this, you are going to lose it."

Senate debate is expected to resume Monday after a monthlong pause.

Mr. Harkin said that as members realize that NATO does not have to be expanded now, support is slipping. He said President Clinton's strong-arm strategy of pushing the agreement with no amendments is "disturbing."

"A lot of senators might get nervous" if it continues, Mr. Harkin predicted. He said his greatest concern is the uncertain cost of expansion, adding, "We should not sign America's name to a blank

check."

Cost estimates for NATO expansion vary wildly, from \$400 million to \$120 billion over 10 years. Cost projections are difficult because it is not clear how many countries will eventually join the alliance or how costs would be divided.

Anti-expansion grass-roots activity has also picked up.

Television commercials produced by a group known as Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities show the Berlin Wall falling and nuclear mushroom clouds rising, saying that NATO expansion could revive diplomatic and military tensions with Russia. The ads will air in Washington on "Nightline," "Meet the Press," "Good Morning America" and other programs and also will run in Vermont, Iowa, Montana and Rhode Island.

NATO's charter calls for member nations to defend any individual member against attack.

The Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary are next in line to join. Eighteen other countries would like to follow, including Slovenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, Bul-

Army counterattacks in sex probe of general

Describes woman to press as 'stalker'

Washington Times...See Pg. 3

U.S. Lacking In Terrorism Defenses

Study Cites a Need To Share Intelligence

Washington Post...See Pg. 3

HNSC Members Make Plea For More Defense Money

Defense Daily...See Pg. 4



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



garia, Macedonia, Slovakia and Croatia.

U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright has said that no country will be denied entry based on its location on the map — leaving some fearful that the alliance that helped win the Cold War could become so overextended as to become a paper tiger.

Phyllis Schlafly, head of the Eagle Forum, said the new world map for which NATO could be responsible is formidable.

"I don't believe the American people want to send their sons and daughters and grandsons and granddaughters to defend this new map," she said.

Sen. Jeff Bingaman, New Mexico Democrat, said expanding NATO is "irrelevant to our security needs."

"I've always been undecided," said Sen. Susan Collins, Maine Republican, who fears Russia's reaction to an expanded alliance. But she said she is leaning toward expanding NATO to help shore up Eastern European democracies.

Other undecided senators said to be leaning against expanding NATO include Ted Stevens, Alaska Republican; Patrick J. Leahy, Vermont Democrat; and Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Colorado Republican.

"There are legitimate concerns out there," said Senate Majority Whip Don Nickles, Oklahoma Republican, who is undecided. "A staff member gave me that much on the negative side," he said, holding his thumb two inches from his forefinger, "and I intend to read it before I decide."

Mr. Harkin and former Sen. Gordon Humphrey, New Hampshire Republican, each said they have sensed an erosion of support for open-ended expansion in their lobbying over the last two weeks.

Figuring that delay only helps expansion opponents, Mr. Clinton has been driving to expand the defense alliance as quickly as possible. But Mr. Lott promised yesterday that "we will not hurry."

Sen. Paul Wellstone, Minnesota

Democrat, described expansion as a "profound mistake" that would lead to the redivision of Europe. He said he is beginning to hear those concerns bubbling up from the grass roots.

Sen. John W. Warner, Virginia Republican, cautioned that if the United States and its NATO partners continue to dilute the alliance by adding countries without adding the dollars necessary to defend those countries, Americans may revolt and say, "Enough is enough. This is not what we intended."

"We cannot let this historic alliance degenerate into dial-a-cop," he said.

But Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, South Dakota Democrat, has predicted that NATO expansion will pass with between 75 and 80 votes.

Mr. Lott, the GOP leader, said he was "not quite as sanguine as" his Democratic counterpart over the level of support for NATO expansion.

"There's not a lot of enthusiasm over here," Mr. Lott said.

USA Today

April 24, 1998

Pg. 5

Unlikely cast gathers to oppose NATO growth

By Barbara Slavin
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — An unusual bipartisan coalition is launching an 11th-hour effort to block expansion of the NATO military alliance.

At a news conference Thursday, nine senators, anti-abortion activist Phyllis Schlafly and a business group led by the liberal Ben Cohen of Ben and Jerry's ice cream urged the Senate to stop NATO's growth.

Formal debate on whether to admit Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic resumes Monday. A vote could come as early as Wednesday.

The measure, a treaty modification, requires 67 votes, or two-thirds of the Senate. It does not go to the House. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was set up in 1949 to confront the Soviet Union in Europe. It now has 16 members.

Some opponents argue that including countries once part of the Soviet empire will cost U.S. taxpayers billions of dollars that could be better spent on social problems at home. Others say expansion would alienate Moscow, force the United States into

dangerous military alliances and blur NATO's mandate.

President Clinton and congressional supporters say NATO should be open to all new free-market democracies in Europe.

At least 20 senators have moved from being in favor of the NATO expansion when Congress recessed three weeks ago to undecided when it returned this week, said Sen. Tom Harkin, D-Iowa. Sen. Bob Smith, R-N.H., says public support is waning as Americans learn more about what NATO expansion might entail.

Supporters say they will have the votes they need. They may have more trouble blocking amendments that would limit expenditures or require a three-year pause before any further growth.

"What's the urgency?" Smith asked at the news conference. "The greatest threat is a situation where Russia and the United States are not allies."

Sen. Kent Conrad, D-N.D., said Russia's more than 7,000 tactical nuclear weapons — "loose nukes" — should be the focus of U.S. concern.

Sen. John Ashcroft, R-Mo., worried that a new NATO would become a "911 for disorders around the globe."

At a speech in Dallas this week, Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, D-N.Y., raised eyebrows when he said that NATO expansion, at a time of Russian weakness in conventional weapons and increased dependence on nuclear weapons, could cause the United States and Russia to "stumble into the catastrophe of nuclear war."

"That's not hyperbole," said Michael Mandelbaum of the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies. If NATO continues to expand as many envision to include the Baltic states on Russia's border — Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia — "we would be moving toward a hair-trigger nuclear balance of the kind we had in the 1950s and '60s," he said.

The Clinton administration, which has made NATO expansion its top foreign policy priority, says expansion would solidify democratic gains in Central and Eastern Europe and decrease the likelihood of small-scale ethnic conflicts and of a wider war.

Army counterattacks in sex probe of general

Describes woman to press as 'stalker'

By Rowan Scarborough
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The Army is conducting a behind-the-scenes campaign to cast doubt on the truthfulness of Donnamaria Carpino, who has rattled service leadership by accusing a two-star general of forcing her into a sexual relationship.

Mrs. Carpino's complaint against retired Maj. Gen. David R. Hale goes to the heart of Army leadership because the department's general counsel is now reviewing a decision by Gen. Dennis Reimer, the Army chief of staff, to let the general retire before the probe was completed.

Army officials are not publicly besmirching Mrs. Carpino. In fact, no official will agree to be quoted by name when discussing the case.

But some are using the word "stalker" in "off-the-record" conversations with reporters, according to reporters who asked not to be named. They said it is part of an Army public relations strategy to try to persuade reporters not to write about Mrs. Carpino's complaint, which was first reported March 27 by The Washington Times.

Seeking her response, a reporter told Mrs. Carpino that Maj. Gen. John G. Myer Jr., chief of Army public affairs, had used the word "stalker" in describing her conduct toward Gen. Hale. Mrs. Carpino's version is that Gen. Hale coerced her into a sexual relationship in 1997 in Turkey, where her then-husband was stationed under the two-star general's command.

Charles Gittins, Mrs. Carpino's attorney, on April 13 sent a letter

of complaint to Defense Department General Counsel Judith Miller about the "stalker" comment.

"The Army is saying anything to dissuade reporters from writing a story," Mr. Gittins said in an interview. "The degree of deception going on is breathtaking."

The Army issued a statement saying: "The conversation Maj. Gen. Myer had with [the reporter] was an 'off-the-record' conversation. Off-the-record means off-the-record. However, portrayal of that conversation as related in the [Gittins] letter is not accurate."

Mrs. Carpino, in a lengthy sworn statement, has told agents of the Pentagon's inspector general's office (IG) that Gen. Hale forced her into a sexual relationship on the promise he would protect her husband from supposed adultery charges by unnamed officers. Gen. Reimer allowed Gen. Hale to retire in February while the probe was a month old.

Her ex-husband, an Army colonel, says he never committed adultery and charges that Gen. Hale fabricated the allegations.

Gen. Hale's military attorney has declined to discuss the investigation.

After learning of being branded a "stalker," Mrs. Carpino commissioned a third lie detector exam by Security Secrets in Vienna, a private firm recommended by the IG.

In the test, Mrs. Carpino was asked, "Did you lie when you said Gen. Hale called you from the Pentagon during 1997 and instructed you to get your husband to leave and requested sexual favors?" Mrs.

Carpino answered "no." According to the company's written report, she was "being truthful to the relevant questions asked."

Mrs. Carpino also has told investigators that Gen. Hale, during their four-month relationship, violated regulations by disclosing classified information. She said that on one occasion Gen. Hale told her about an Israeli top secret, or "black," military program. The lie-detector test report said she was telling the truth.

There are now three inquiries under way as a result of Mrs. Carpino's complaint. The Pentagon IG is investigating the sexual allegations. Defense Secretary William S. Cohen has ordered the general counsel to review the retirement decision itself.

Meanwhile, the third probe came to light in an April 13 letter from the Army to Sen. Olympia J. Snowe, Maine Republican, that Gen. Reimer has directed an internal inquiry into the procedures for the retirement of one- and two-star generals. The secretary of defense approves retirements for three- and four-star officers.

There are indications, however, that the general counsel is conducting a limited inquiry and is not looking at whether Gen. Reimer acted properly in letting Gen. Hale retire. Mrs. Carpino said an officer in the general counsel's office told her the inquiry only deals with the lines of communication between the Pentagon IG and the Army.

The Army has said Gen. Reimer was aware Gen. Hale was under investigation. But Gen. Reimer did not know the specific charges when he approved the retirement of Gen. Hale, who was then the Army's deputy IG at the Pentagon.

The Army maintains it could court-martial Gen. Hale or recall him to active duty for punishment if the investigation warrants. But legal sources say the military rarely invokes such authority. Normally, they say, officers remain on active duty until an investigation is completed.

U.S. Lacking In Terrorism Defenses

Study Cites a Need To Share Intelligence

By Roberto Suro
Washington Post Staff Writer

Three years after the Oklahoma City bombing, a major interagency study has found widespread deficiencies in the

federal government's ability to combat terrorism, from a lack of intelligence-sharing on domestic plotters to the need for smaller tracking devices that will escape detection when placed on people and cars.

The 73-page study reveals a government anxiously taking inventory of its defenses against new and potentially devastating threats within the United States, such as terrorist use of biological weapons. Of-

ficials familiar with the document described it as the initial product of a broad assessment of policies, personnel and facilities that is without precedent in federal law enforcement.

Since the April 19, 1995, Oklahoma City bombing, the FBI and the Justice Department have made extensive efforts to establish relationships with state and local authorities to share information on potential

domestic terrorist threats. Nonetheless, the study concludes, "the single most significant deficiency in the nation's ability to combat terrorism is a lack of information, particularly regarding domestic terrorism."

The study, a draft of which was given to The Washington Post by a government official who declined to be identified, cites major concerns with "increased activity by small cells of terrorists or individuals who are inspired by, but not affiliated with, terrorist groups, thus making them harder to identify and stop."

For example, the prosecutors who won convictions against Timothy J. McVeigh and Terry L. Nichols in the 1995 bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building argued that they borrowed ideology from militia groups but acted on their own. The current study reflects a conclusion that such lone terrorists, rather than radical organizations, now represent the most likely -- and most difficult to combat -- domestic threat, said a senior federal law enforcement officer.

The study commissioned by Attorney General Janet Reno and several other government initiatives -- most prominently, the drafting of a new, classified presidential directive that will set overall terrorism-fighting strategy -- reflect a growing sense of urgency evident on Capitol Hill, at the White

House and in virtually every federal agency that deals with the issue.

Also driving the process, officials said, are growing concerns about the potential use of chemical, biological or nuclear weapons of mass destruction by terrorists and worries that the nation's information infrastructure is vulnerable to high-tech attacks.

The interagency study reveals a government still trying to determine how it will grapple with these unfamiliar challenges.

For example, the study notes that there does not appear to be a formal system for relaying information from the Customs Service to the FBI when chemical, biological or nuclear weapons material is interdicted coming into the country, even though in the rare cases when that has happened, officials have successfully improvised to get the word out.

Similarly, the study depicts the difficulties of preparing federal prosecutors to handle cases involving such weapons when there are no ready precedents to fall back on. And the absence of previous crimes means that a new law governing the use of materials in weapons of mass destruction "will remain a weak deterrent until it is successfully enforced."

The document lists numerous recent initiatives to coordinate counterterrorism work by more than 20 agencies as dispa-

rate as the Federal Railroad Administration and the CIA, but the report emphasizes that bureaucratic hurdles remain.

On the sensitive question of how law enforcement and intelligence agencies share information, for example, the document cites "reliance on paper distribution and manual routing of information" and "inadequate computer support" as major deficiencies that have "severely hampered" the analysis of intelligence information relating to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Other complaints point to the difficulties of handling highly sensitive counterintelligence information about foreign governments that normally does not go beyond a very narrow circle of officials but that might need to be distributed more widely to understand terrorism threats.

The study also includes wish list items from a variety of agencies, including the FBI, which cites a need for a "reduction in size of tracking devices, currently difficult to install covertly due to large size," and the Justice Department's computer crimes section, which complains about "an insufficient amount of funding in order to properly equip investigators with the most up-to-date hardware and software."

Congress, in its conference committee report accompany-

ing the 1998 Justice Department appropriations bill, directed Reno to develop a five-year plan to coordinate national policy and operational capabilities to combat terrorism. The plan must be submitted by the end of this year and then will be updated annually.

As a starting point, Reno commissioned the interagency study, which was conducted by six committees of officials drawn from across the government. This planning has evolved in a series of steps since the Oklahoma City bombing -- the most deadly act of domestic terrorism -- startled Washington into action.

In the wake of the attack, the Clinton administration developed Presidential Decision Directive 39, a classified document that established a new framework for assigning and coordinating counterterrorism duties. And Congress has repeatedly appropriated new funds to boost the overall strength of key agencies, such as the FBI, and for specific programs, such as airport security.

Now, a new presidential directive that would revise the decision-making framework is being debated by top federal officials and the five-year plan is being drafted to set long-term budget objectives. Both these efforts reflect a desire to step back and proceed more methodically, according to senior officials.

Defense Daily

April 24, 1998

Pg. 1

HNSC Members Make Plea For More Defense Money

By Sheila Foote

In a plea to increase defense spending, the chairman and other leading members of the House National Security Committee (HNSC) have written to the president and House and Senate leadership requesting that they reopen negotiations on last year's balanced budget agreement.

But Senate leaders indicated yesterday that they do not think that reopening the budget agreement is politically realistic. Said Sen. Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.), "I'd like more money for defense, but I think we should stick with the balanced budget agreement, because if we open that gate all kinds of ugly animals will come through."

Lott asked, "Do [the members asking for more spending on defense] think we can get through the House and the Senate with the 60 votes that would be necessary to raise defense spending without raising money in other areas? I doubt it."

Sen. Don Nickles (R-Okla.), the assistant majority leader, told *Defense Daily* that he is "pretty reluctant to open [the budget agreement up]" because "there's a lot of people wanting to spend the so-called surplus."

The April 22 letter, signed by HNSC Chairman Floyd Spence (R-S.C.), ranking member Rep. Ike Skelton (D-Mo.) and nine other HNSC subcommittee chairmen and ranking members, notes that the DoD's FY '99 defense budget request represents the 14th consecutive year of real decline in defense spending.

"At what we believe to be a critical point in history, the mismatch between the nation's military strategy and the resources required to implement it is growing," the members state. "Consequently, a wide range of quality of life, readiness and modernization shortfalls have developed, that, if left unchecked, threaten the long-term viability of today's all-volunteer force."

Earlier this week, the committee released lists from the military services of unfunded requirements in the next five years totaling \$59

billion. The services provided the lists to HNSC after the chairman asked them to detail their unfunded requirements (*Defense Daily* March 25, 27, 30).

The Pentagon has estimated that it needs to spend around \$60 billion per year on procurement to replace aging weapons systems with more modern equipment. Under the DoD five-year budget plan, it would reach this goal in FY '01.

Though defense hawks have made much of the fact that the military today has many unfunded requirements, Army Acting Secretary Robert Walker reminded Congress earlier this year that the military has always had unmet needs.

Walker told the Senate Armed Services Committee that he had just reviewed the Army's 1985 budget book, which was compiled at the height of the Reagan defense build-up. "It was filled with discussion about how we were short for the National Guard and for the active Army in a whole variety of areas," Walker said. "So we have never been able to fund all of our components at 100 percent of requirement."

In their letter, the HNSC members predict that Pentagon efforts to reform acquisition practices, streamline the bureaucracy and shrink the infrastructure will not produce enough savings to adequately fund the military.

"Despite several years of aggressive Pentagon reform, it is apparent that even if the most optimistic estimates of reform-generated savings materialize, they will fall far short of adequately addressing underfunded quality of life, readiness and modernization requirements as well as the inevitable deployments in the years ahead."

The HNSC members ask the leadership to reopen negotiations on the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, given the context of the strong economy and the fact that the nation has achieved its first federal budget surplus in three decades.

Washington Times

April 24, 1998

Pg. 13

Family seeks to test Tomb remains

Defense reluctant to open shrine

By Otto Kreisher
COPLEY NEWS SERVICE

Pentagon officials face a wrenching decision that pits the sanctity of one of the nation's most revered shrines, the Tomb of the Unknowns, against a family's desire to know the fate of a loved one believed to have died in Vietnam.

The family of Air Force 1st Lt. Michael J. Blassie has asked the Pentagon to open the tomb's Vietnam crypt to allow DNA testing to determine if the remains buried there in 1984 are Lt. Blassie's.

Lt. Blassie, a 1970 Air Force Academy graduate, was believed to have been killed May 11, 1972, when his A-37 light attack jet was

seen crashing in flames during an air support mission near An Loc, South Vietnam.

His body could not be recovered at the time, but skeletal remains, fragments of a flight suit and an identification card, reportedly with Lt. Blassie's name, were found in that location five months later.

Based on evidence detailed by CBS News in January, the Blassie family is convinced his remains are buried at the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery.

The family wants the remains exhumed so they can match the DNA from those bones with a blood sample from his mother, Jean Blassie of Florissant, Mo., said Pat Blassie, Lt. Blassie's younger sister.

The Blassies' request has been backed strongly by the major vet-

erans organizations and many individual veterans.

"We don't believe — no one believes — this is unreasonable, given that we are committed to full accounting" of all war casualties and missing in action, Miss Blassie said in a telephone interview from Atlanta.

But the idea of tearing open the shrine apparently is giving the Clinton administration, particularly the Defense Department, considerable anxiety.

To study the family's request, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen has appointed a task force co-chaired by Rudy DeLeon, undersecretary for personnel, and Jan Lodai, a deputy undersecretary for policy, and including representative of the four armed services and the POW-Missing Persons office, said Air Force Lt. Col. Tom Begines, a Pentagon spokesman.

USA Today April 24, 1998 Pg. 8

CYBERWARS: Hackers have been detected in military computers more than 2,000 times in the 1990s, but that's probably just a tiny fraction of the intrusions. They have stolen software and left viruses but haven't hurt national security, Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said. "We think the classified systems are secure," he said, referring to programs used for conducting warfare. There were 575 hacking incidents detected last year, down from more than 725 the year before.

— Steve Komarow

Washington Times April 24, 1998 Pg. 17

Yemeni leader rules out military bases for U.S.

SANA, Yemen — Yemeni President Ali Abdallah Saleh yesterday ruled out any possibility of granting the United States military bases in Yemeni territory.

"It is not our policy to grant facilities to the United States," Mr. Saleh said when asked about

press reports that San'a might grant Washington facilities on the island of Socotra once used by the Soviet Union.

"It is not Yemeni policy to allow the establishment of bases on Socotra, American or otherwise," he said.

"Socotra is an important tourist area and we are looking to Arab and foreign investors to develop it."

Cohen seeks open minds to help close more bases

By Lisa Hoffman
Scripps Howard News Service

WASHINGTON — Pentagon chief William Cohen has put the Senate in his sights as the most likely route to victory in his long-odds battle to get permission for another two rounds of politically unpopular military base closings. Defense Department and Capitol Hill officials say Cohen recognizes that the chance of convincing the House that the nation must shut down more bases is slim to none in this election year.

In many congressional districts, military installations account for thousands of jobs and

communities fear their loss will mean economic ruin.

Cohen, himself a former GOP senator from Maine who argued against closing facilities in his state, sees the Senate as sometimes markedly less parochial than the House. And, while every House member faces re-election in November, only about one-third of the Senate does.

If the Senate were to approve more closings, according to this lobbying strategy, a deal could be worked out later in a conference committee that would allow the House to give its tacit approval but without requiring each member to vote

on it. Cohen and top military leaders say that two more rounds of base closings — in 2001 and 2005 — are essential if America is to have the money to buy critically needed new weapons and equipment for the troops.

In the first four rounds, which occurred between 1988 and 1995, about 100 of the military's 495 major facilities were targeted for extinction. The end of the Cold War has led to a 36 percent drop in the number of troops America needs, but only 23 percent of the supporting infrastructure has been reduced. That means taxpayers are spending billions of dollars each year on excess buildings and bases, Cohen and the others say.

One likely area for cutting is the facilities that come under the umbrella of the Army Ma-

teriel Command. Gen. Johnnie E. Wilson, head of that command, gave the most concrete indication of which installations might find themselves on the chopping block. Bluntly saying that Congress either must increase defense spending or shut bases, Wilson told the industry newsletter Inside the Army this month that his command would shoulder a significant measure of the closings. He said his goal was to slash the number of facilities under his command from the current 62 to 39 by 2010.

Wilson gave no hint which facilities might be expendable. Some of the command's best-known facilities are the White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico, the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland and the Redstone Arsenal in Alabama.

Proposal calls for one round of closures

Senators Consider Tying BRAC To Larger Infrastructure Reduction Plan

Base closure supporters on the Senate Armed Services Committee are considering introducing legislation that calls for one round of closures, instead of two, and requires the Pentagon to identify the space it needs before any Base Closure and Realignment Commission action is taken, congressional and industry sources said this week.

Sources cautioned that it has not yet been determined exactly what shape BRAC legislation will take -- whether base closure language will be part of a larger DOD infrastructure reform package or introduced at all.

One option being considered, however, is a variation of draft language drawn up in February by the Washington, DC-based Business Executives for National Security. The BENS legislation calls for a BRAC round in 2001, although Pentagon leaders want base closure rounds in 2001 and 2003 to fund needed weapon modernization.

Sen. Charles Robb (D-VA) and other BRAC supporters on the committee may co-sign base closure language as part of overall infrastructure reduction legislation, which in addition calls on the Pentagon to push the services to use joint basing arrangements, and reexamine outsourcing laboratories, test and evaluation centers, and information systems agencies as part of a defense infrastructure master plan.

A copy of the BENS legislation also states that bases could not be "privatized in place" unless BRAC specifically recommended that action, one source said.

Calling for one round instead of two lessens the likelihood that the first BRAC round would postpone tough decisions, one congressional source said. Closures or realignments directed by BRAC 2001 could be carried out in phases. This tactic would spread out the initial closing costs, which can be significant, and thereby minimize the need for two rounds, the source said.

"This way you are not stringing along communities" that may not be on the list in 2001, but could be in 2003, the source said, a sentiment echoed also by House and Senate critics of BRAC.

Another frequent complaint is that BRAC is offered as a fix to modernization funding problems that can really only be fixed by adding billions dollars more to defense budgets.

Defense Secretary William Cohen's argument that two additional BRAC rounds could save \$20 billion over eight years misses the point, these critics say. If BRAC is a budget driven process, the Pentagon and the commission may go too far in their effort to save as much money as possible, critics contend.

The legislation under discussion would require DOD to define its end game requirements, or exactly how much space it needs to meet requirements, prior to a BRAC round, the source said. Cohen's base closure report sent to Congress earlier this month notes that DOD has about 23 percent excess capacity, but Capitol Hill sources they want more specificity.

One of the reasons this latest call for base closure faces such an uphill battle dates to the 1995 BRAC decision to close Kelly and McClellan AFBs. President Clinton made what many considered to be a politically motivated decision to offer the bases' depot work to private companies which agreed to keep the work in San Antonio and Sacramento.

Those workloads are now being offered in public-private competitions that include the remaining three Air Force air logistics

centers. But the House Depot Caucus and its Senate allies don't trust Clinton enough to pass another BRAC round, sources said.

One congressional source in the office of a BRAC supporter said its success in the Senate will depend on whether Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS), who opposed similar legislation last year, gets on board.

But passage through the House of Representatives appears bleak. The House National Security Committee dominated by the House Depot Caucus has no plans to vote on additional BRAC rounds, one House source said.

Previous BRAC direction should be carried out first before any more rounds are agreed to, the source said, referring to another Clinton directive that has been delayed until the last possible year for transferring the Kelly and McClellan depot work. -- *Jim Snyder*

New York Times

April 24, 1998

Iraq Again Threatens to Halt Arms Inspections

By Barbara Crossette

UNITED NATIONS -- President Saddam Hussein made his most direct threat on Thursday to provoke another crisis over arms inspections unless an economic embargo on Iraq is lifted next week by the U.N. Security Council.

The United States would "pay dearly" for not heeding the warning, a statement from the Iraqi cabinet said. Iraq threatened last November to stop all cooperation with the arms inspections by May, and some officials here fear the Iraqis may follow through on that threat if events in the council do not go their way.

The cabinet statement, issued in Baghdad after a meeting presided over by Saddam, came as the deputy prime minister, Tariq Aziz, formally demanded in a letter to the Security Council that sanctions be lifted "immediately without any new restrictions or conditions." The letter was sent to Hisashi Owada, Japan's representative and this month's council president.

Aziz dismissed the latest report from the U.N. Special Commission -- the arms inspectors -- which criticized Iraq for withholding information on arms programs, as full of "tremendous and flagrant fallacies and lies."

Iraq will get an opportunity to deliver its message directly to council members on Monday in an informal session requested by Russia, which may also propose that intrusive inspections for nuclear weapons in Iraq be stopped and replaced by passive monitoring, diplomats said. The International Atomic Energy Agency reported last week that Iraq had

successfully accounted for most of its nuclear program.

Iraq would like help from its friends, particularly Russia and France, in finding ways to whittle down the power of the inspection process, assuming sanctions remain, diplomats said. On Thursday at a House subcommittee hearing in Washington, Bill Richardson, the U.S. representative to the United Nations, said without elaborating that he expected to face "efforts to weaken the disarmament provisions of the Security Council resolution."

James Rubin, the State Department spokesman, said in an interview that Iraq should have learned that there can be no quick technical fixes to hasten the end of sanctions, which were imposed in 1990 after Iraq invaded Kuwait.

"Unfortunately Iraq continues to make threats instead of coming clean with the requirements of U.N. Security Council resolutions," Rubin said. "Sanctions will stay on, as long as Iraq continues to flout U.N. resolutions. That is not the view of the United States; that is the view of all the members of the Security Council."

Rubin noted that a military force remained in the Persian Gulf area and said the United States is still prepared to use it.

In his letter to the council, Aziz accused the commission's executive chairman, Richard Butler of Australia, with conducting a political vendetta against Iraq while gathering intelligence for Washington.

U.N. and Clinton administration officials expected Iraq to press for a lifting of sanctions before the end of the year.

But few expected the high-pitched campaign to force a debate now, during the first

major review of sanctions since the crisis in January and February that brought the United States and Iraq close to war.

To a large extent, Iraq is using familiar tactics: attacking Butler while testing the level of support the United States will have in the council. The Iraqi move comes only a few months after Washington failed to win much backing for a military attack during the last crisis.

The last unalloyed U.S. victory in the council occurred last fall, when a resolution was passed that demanded a ban on international travel by senior Iraqi officials. That resolution has never been put into effect: the foreign minister, Mohammed Said al-Sahaf, and the oil minister, Amir Mohammed Rashid, are in New York for the Security Council meetings.

On Monday the Security Council begins one of two comprehensive reviews of sanctions scheduled for this year; the second is planned for October. Diplomats and U.N. officials have assumed the sanctions would be continued during the current review.

In his 22-page letter to Owada, Aziz demanded a public hearing of all charges against Baghdad to permit Iraqi officials to clear up any outstanding issues.

The Iraqis also hoped to do this during "technical experts' meetings" that were called earlier this year at Baghdad's request to get an independent review of evidence. They were disappointed when experts from a wide range of countries -- including some on the council sympathetic to Iraq -- wrote reports similar to that of Butler, who said last week that there had been no progress in the last six months in closing files on biological, chemical or missile programs.

Under council resolutions, when files are closed the United Nations can continue to monitor Iraq but can no longer conduct intrusive inspections at will. A complex high-

technology monitoring system is in place, but it is lightly guarded and could be fairly easily seized or disabled by Iraq.

Aziz said Iraq objects to Butler's reluctance to accept Baghdad's declarations of compliance.

"In more than one part of the report," Aziz wrote of Butler's account, "the executive chairman attacks Iraq's statements and declarations that it no long has prohibited weapons, mentioning the expression 'in contrast with the evidence available.'"

Aziz says that to demand verification while withholding evidence "is a police procedure, and not one pertaining to the work of the United Nations."

Butler -- who like his predecessor, Rolf Ekeus, a Swedish diplomat who is now ambassador to the United States, has presented evidence to Iraq on numerous occasions -- says the Iraqis are trying to claim "disarmament by declaration."

The Economist
April 25 - May 1, 1998

The dhows that do the Iraqi run

DUBAI -- Wooden dhows, the Gulf's traditional sailing vessels, are busy ferrying illicit consumer goods into Iraq under the noses of the UN-backed interdiction force that has been patrolling the Gulf's international waters since 1991. Iraq pays for these goods with fuel oil smuggled out of the country in barges.

The illicit oil sales, although tiny in comparison with the UN's oil-for-food programme, bring their revenues directly to the Iraqi regime. One guess is that the Iraqi government could

be smuggling some 100,000 barrels a day, enough to earn it up to \$200m a year after bribes and price discounts. The oil is loaded on to small barges, often crewed by Iranians. After picking up false Iranian papers at one of the hundreds of small ports along Iran's coastline, the barges sail through Iranian waters towards the open sea.

It is far from easy to detect smuggling in the chaotic jumble at Dubai's creekside docks. Moreover, some traders admit openly to selling goods illicitly

to Iraq. "Of course we do the Iraqi run," says one, a Pakistani entrepreneur waiting at the dockside for his next delivery. "It's more difficult at the moment, but that means more money for us."

Nor are the governments in the region particularly keen to stop the trade. A couple of months ago, Iran promised to crack down on smuggling, and as a result, say American officials, illegal oil shipments may have fallen by half. Most peo-

ple expect them to go up again soon. The government of the United Arab Emirates, for its part, has promised to halt illegal shipments passing its ports and to refuse docking rights to barges. But few traders believe that the promise will be carried out with any verve.

The UAE's president, Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan al-Nahayan, has long argued that Iraq has suffered enough for its misdeeds. His country has resumed telecoms links with Iraq

and has relaxed visa requirements for Iraqis. It has also sought and received UN approval for a passenger ferry service between Dubai and Umm al-Qasr in Iraq. Indeed, legitimate trade between Iraq and the emirates has grown so quickly that the UAE has overtaken Jordan as Iraq's principal trading partner. "The feeling here is that it's time Saddam was back in the brotherhood," said a Dubai businessman. "Smuggling will continue until sanctions are lifted."

New York Times

April 24, 1998

U.S. And Allies Plan to Curb Bosnian Propaganda

By Philip Shenon

WASHINGTON -- The United States and its Western allies in the Bosnia peacekeeping operation are creating a tribunal that will have the power to shut radio and television stations and punish newspapers that it decides are engaged in propaganda that is undermining the peace.

Western officials involved in organizing the panel, which is charged with drafting new laws to regulate broadcast outlets in Bosnia-Herzegovina, said its powers would be used to stop what they described as poisonous propaganda.

The move is raising concerns among journalists' organizations and other civil liberties groups. Those groups say they are concerned about any attempt by an alliance of democratic nations to impose restraints on the press and broadcasting in another country.

The proposed tribunal, which would be partly financed by the United States, highlights the awkward situation in which the United States finds itself, both as an international defender of free speech and as a military power trying to enforce a peacekeeping agreement among fractious ethnic groups.

Western officials involved in organizing the panel said it would monitor what news organizations publish and broadcast to be certain that they met what are deemed "internationally accepted standards."

Organizations that are determined to have published or

broadcast propaganda in violation of those standards would be subject to formal warnings, fines and, for radio and television stations, revocation of their licenses.

While acknowledging that they felt uncomfortable regulating broadcasters and print reporters' work, Western officials refused to describe the tribunal as the sort of censorship usually associated with an occupying military power.

The officials said they felt they had no other option, given the venomous propaganda that they said often masquerades as news coverage in Bosnia and that can threaten the safety of the U.S.-led NATO peacekeeping force there.

"Basically there's a tradition here of propaganda in the class of Goebbels," said Simon Haselock, a spokesman in Bosnia for the civilian operations of the peacekeeping force. "What we're trying to do is put in place a regime that offers a legal framework that improves and guarantees press freedom. It's not about censorship."

Other attempts have been made by international peacekeeping operations elsewhere in the world to stem the spread of false information by warring factions after civil wars by setting up independent news organizations to counter the propaganda. But Haselock said the Bosnian plan went further by creating a monitoring panel and giving it the power to punish and even close radio and television stations.

"This is all pretty groundbreaking," he said.

Inflammatory radio and television broadcasts in Bosnia have long been used by the various factions to threaten the fragile peace in the Balkans. In recent broadcasts on Bosnian Serb radio and television, British peacekeeping troops were depicted as fascist forces intent on slaughtering Serbs, and NATO aircraft were said to have dispersed toxic chemicals over Bosnian Serb communities.

Yet while they concede that the manipulation of news organizations in Bosnia has often undermined the peace effort, groups that advocate press freedom say they are concerned about any attempt by an alliance of democratic nations to impose restraints on the press in Bosnia.

"I think there is a good intention here, which is to try to create a transitional structure to allow media to function professionally," said Aidan White, general secretary of the International Federation of Journalists. "But if you construct a process that basically acts as a legal monitoring body with jurisdiction over journalists, you are taking a step backwards."

A State Department official who insisted on anonymity said, "There are obvious free-speech concerns, but we need to put in place something to deal with the abuses of the media -- the hate, the racial epithets and ethnic slurs."

This is not the first time that the Western nations overseeing the peace efforts have moved to stem broadcasts in Bosnia.

In October, NATO peacekeepers seized four important television transmitters controlled by Radovan Karadzic, the hard-line Bosnian Serb leader, after he had refused to end attacks against international organizations that were working in Bosnia.

Western officials said the new panel, the Intermediate Media Standards and Licensing Commission, should begin work in the spring, in time to begin monitoring coverage of the campaign that will lead to national elections in September. The commission is expected to have a staff of 30, half Bosnians, and a budget this year of \$2.7 million.

According to a draft charter for the panel, it "will provide a mechanism by which the media of Bosnia and Herzegovina will be restructured in accordance with internationally recognized standards."

"It is intended," the draft says, "that this should take place with sufficient speed to ensure the provision of free, balanced, unbiased and pluralist information prior to the September 1998 elections, thereafter to ensure that Western democratic standards governing the media are permanently embedded."

The draft says an "intervention tribunal" would be created as part of the commission to review complaints against news organizations and to order punishments, if the organizations are found to be engaged in propaganda.

The tribunal, which is expected to be led by a non-

Bosnian lawyer, would have the power to order news organizations to issue public apologies, to impose fines and to revoke broadcast licenses.

Havelock, spokesman for the civilian peacekeeping operation, said the plan had been welcomed by local reporters and editors in Bosnia, because it should guarantee them some freedom from meddling by political leaders.

"The journalists welcome it wholeheartedly," he said. "This should give them the framework to allow them to report independently."

Rioting Bosnian Serbs Hurt Croat Cardinal

Agence France-Presse

TUZLA, Bosnia and Herzegovina, -- Serbs trapped Bosnia's most senior Roman Catholic clergyman inside a church for six hours Thursday, then stoned him as the police escorted him out with worshippers, a United Nations spokesman said.

The clergyman, Vinko Cardinal Puljic, and a number of others suffered injuries, said Andrea Angeli of the International Police Task Force in

Bosnia-Herzegovina, a United Nations agency.

Up to 1,000 Serbs had surrounded the church in Dervanta, where Cardinal Puljic was to attend a mass, Angeli said.

"It was not very easy, because during the evacuation the crowd threw a lot of stones, injuring some people" including Cardinal Puljic, Angeli said.

Norwegian troops with the NATO-led Stabilization Force in Bosnia monitored the tense situation, and provided three buses and armored vehicles for the evacuation, he said.

It was not clear what brought on the incident, but tension persists in many parts of Bosnia between Serbs, Croats and Muslims, more than two years after the end of the 1992-95 war. Serbs are Orthodox and Croats are Catholic.

Earlier in the day Serbs cut trees along a road to block and turn back 20 buses that were bringing 600 people down from the Croatian border city of Slavonski Brod to attend the mass, Angeli said.

Dervanta is about 10 miles from the Sava River which forms the border between Bosnia and Croatia.

France Denies Its Officer Who Met With Karadzic Compromised Arrest Plans

By Charles Trueheart
Washington Post
Foreign Service

PARIS, April 23—Faced with embarrassing disclosures about a French military officer's contacts in Bosnia with Bosnian Serb war-crimes suspect Radovan Karadzic, the French government today denied "categorically" that the officer had compromised an allied plan to capture Karadzic.

The French presidential palace and Foreign Ministry maintained near-total public silence on the case, first reported in today's Washington Post, offering a terse Defense Ministry communique as the official response of the French government.

The statement did not deny the report that the officer had met repeatedly with Karadzic and said only that "a French officer maintained various contacts consonant with his orders. As soon as the course of these contacts could have appeared questionable, this officer was immediately given a new assignment in France."

The Defense Ministry said the officer's actions "in no way jeopardized Radovan Karadzic's arrest." It repeated the French government's support for bringing Karadzic and all other indicted war crimes suspects from the 1992-95 Balkans conflict to justice at the

U.N. criminal tribunal in The Hague. Karadzic, the former Bosnian Serb political leader, and his former military chief Ratko Mladic are the most-wanted of the suspects still at large.

A French Defense Ministry spokesman, Pierre Bayle, and his counterpart at the Foreign Ministry, Anne Gazeau-Secret, refused to elaborate on the statement or to provide any details about the French officer, whom they did not name.

Sources identified him as army Maj. Herve Gourmelon, the principal liaison officer to the Serbs inside the French military sector of Bosnia. Sources Wednesday had given the spelling of his name as Gourmillon.

His transfer occurred in December, about three months after NATO plans for Karadzic's arrest reportedly were drawn up. It is unclear when U.S. officials, according to sources, confronted the French with evidence of the improper contacts.

French officials said Gourmelon had been doing his job maintaining contacts with Bosnian Serbs who might be useful in apprehending war crimes suspects or persuading them to surrender. But by meeting with Karadzic, a violation of NATO rules, the officer crossed a line, according to one French official, who ar-

gued that the communique's opaque language should be read as a reprimand against the officer.

Senior U.S. officials were quoted by The Post as saying France's role in the botched plan to arrest Karadzic had poisoned relations with the United States, Britain and other NATO allies involved in maintaining peace in Bosnia. State Department spokesman James P. Rubin today referred questions about the matter to the French government after saying France and the United States "have worked extremely well together."

France's sometimes ambivalent attitude toward the U.N. war crimes tribunal burst into controversy in mid-December when Defense Minister Alain Richard said French officers called to testify in The Hague would "never" be permitted to participate in a "judicial spectacle."

Richard's comments embarrassed his government and drew denunciations in the French press. They prompted the chief prosecutor at the tribunal, Canadian Louise Arbour, to charge that France was failing to forcefully pursue the arrest of persons indicted as war crimes suspects in the French sector of Bosnia.

"Many war criminals can be found in the French sector," she said in Le Monde newspaper, "and they feel absolutely safe" from arrest. Her remarks drew a protest from the French government.

U.S. to Request Sanctions Against Yugoslavia After Kosovo Violence

By R. Jeffrey Smith
Washington Post Staff Writer

The Clinton administration will push next week for new sanctions against the Yugoslav government to protest mounting violence in the republic of Kosovo, including a stiffer international ban on foreign investments and a freeze on Yugoslav assets held overseas, administration and diplomatic sources said yesterday.

U.S. officials said they expect these and other measures to be approved next Wednesday at a meeting in Rome of the "contact group" of senior officials from the leading Western powers -- the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Russia and Italy -- involved in international policy toward the Balkans.

The new effort to punish Yugoslavia comes after a series of defiant statements and actions by its president, Slobodan Milosevic, and heightened clashes between ethnic Albanian extremists and units of Serb paramilitary and army troops. Wire services reported yesterday that Serb officials claimed to have slain 22 or 23 Albanians in a clash on

Wednesday night near the republic's border with Albania.

The contact group persuaded the U.N. Security Council on March 31 to bar arms exports to Yugoslavia and threatened to impose the additional penalties if Milosevic refused to withdraw special police units from the republic and begin new negotiations with Albanian political leaders about Kosovo's future. Albanians comprise roughly 90 percent of the population of Kosovo, which is a province of Serbia, but they have long chafed under Serb political and

military control.

Milosevic responded by deriding foreign "meddling" in the internal dispute, and yesterday he orchestrated a public referendum that is expected to give an overwhelming endorsement to his refusal of international mediation in any negotiations with the Albanians. U.S. officials have termed the referendum, which the Albanians boycotted, a cheap trick.

In a deliberate slap at Milosevic, the administration this week publicly embraced one of his strongest political oppo-

nents in Yugoslavia, Milo Djukanovic, the charismatic 36-year-old who recently was elected president of the Yugoslav republic of Montenegro. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright effusively praised him on Wednesday for backing not only the idea of foreign mediation in Kosovo but also the republic's democratization and economic reform.

Albright and other senior officials pledged that Washington would do its utmost next week to see that the people of Montenegro are exempted from

the new sanctions and to encourage new private investment in the republic's tourism industry and civil infrastructure.

In an interview with Washington Post reporters and editors, Djukanovic said he will try to forge an alliance with any like-minded politicians in Serbia to undermine Milosevic's control, and promote political reforms that will ally the country with developed nations in Europe. He said the situation in Kosovo had deteriorated "because of blindness on the part of the leadership of Serbia."

Washington Times

April 24, 1998

Pg. 15

Serbs put West role in Kosovo to a vote

22 infiltrators killed, Yugoslav army says

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia (Reuters) — Yugoslav army sources said yesterday that troops killed 22 infiltrators in Kosovo before Serbs voted in a referendum to thwart Western intervention in the troubled province.

The referendum, held amid growing unrest between Serbs and Kosovo's ethnic Albanian majority, drew a turnout of more than 60 percent of the 7.2 million electorate, Serbian state television said minutes before polling ended.

No official results were released by the electoral commission, but the turnout needed to top 50 per-

cent for the referendum to be valid. An overwhelming majority against a Western role was expected.

The referendum was called in support of Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic's rejection of international mediation in talks with Kosovo Albanians seeking autonomy for Serbia's southernmost province.

Official results are expected today on the eve of a deadline to Mr. Milosevic from the so-called Contact Group to open talks with the Kosovo Albanians or risk sanctions.

Unofficial reports indicated a strong boycott of the referendum in Kosovo and other areas inhabited by national minorities.

The army reported repulsing three overnight attempts by supporters of the underground Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) to cross into Serbia's southern province.

In the largest incursion, about 200 armed men were scattered in a firefight near the border village of Kosare, a statement said.

Yugoslav army sources said troops killed 22 infiltrators in the clash when they tried to cross into Kosovo from Albania.

The sources said that the army suffered no casualties but that one infiltrator was wounded and two were taken prisoner in the clash in

rugged mountainous terrain Wednesday night.

Military sources said that heavily armed Yugoslav army troops equipped with howitzers and multiple-rocket launchers had been deployed in the area.

In Kosovo and throughout Serbia, thousands of people voted in the referendum against what they regard as Western interference in support of ethnic Albanians, who outnumber them 9-1 in the southern Serbian province.

Albanians boycotted the referendum on whether Yugoslavia should accept foreign mediation in negotiations between the two ethnic groups on Albanian demands for independence.

"I have circled the 'no' to protect my ancestral home. Kosovo is Serbia and will remain Serbia as long as there are Serbs left here. There is nothing the world can do about it," Pristina resident Vojislav Miladinovic said.

The international community has told the Albanians that secession is not an option and has pressed both sides to launch an urgent dialogue.

Mr. Milosevic called the referendum after the United States threatened intervention in Kosovo following a crackdown by Serbian police on ethnic Albanian separatists seven weeks ago in which 80 Albanians were killed.

Washington Post

April 24, 1998

Pg. 5

House Omits IMF Funding From Bill

The House last night backed its Republican leaders' decision to omit \$18 billion for the International Monetary Fund from an emergency spending bill, casting fresh doubt over the proposal's fate.

Voting 222 to 186, the House rejected a Democratic proposal to instruct House conferees to include the IMF funds in a bill providing disaster relief and funding for military operations. Republican leaders had agreed earlier in the day to deal separately—and later—with the controversial IMF issue.

House Majority Leader Richard K. Armey (R-Tex.), who described the IMF as a "blind racehorse running in the wrong direction and dragging others with it," declined to say if or when the IMF bill would be considered. But a spokesman for Senate negotiators said they will insist on setting a date for action before agreeing to final approval of the emergency bill.

House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) sharply criticized the IMF as "consistently wrong" in its decisions but said the House will bring "an appropriate bill to the floor this year in the appropriate way."

New York Times

April 24, 1998

The Senate's Duty on NATO

The Senate has betrayed its obligations with its pitiful performance on NATO expansion. Instead of illuminating the complex issues involved in extending the alliance eastward, and weighing the potentially grave consequences, the Senate has treated the matter as a legislative afterthought, flippantly fitting a few hours of debate between other bills. With discussion soon to resume on whether to approve membership for Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, the Senate can redeem itself by taking an exacting look at the most important foreign policy decision America has faced since the end of the cold war.

That is the Senate's constitutional duty, and it must not be forsaken just because Trent Lott, the majority leader, does not seem to appreciate the difference between amending an international treaty and debating a highway bill. The reason the Constitution requires a two-thirds Senate majority to approve or revise a treaty is that vital American security interests are usually involved. In this case, the Senate must decide whether to commit American military forces, including nuclear weapons, to the defense of Warsaw, Budapest and Prague.

That alone should give the Senate pause. For all the White House's smooth talk about expanding democracy and prosperity in Europe, the enlargement of NATO comes down to a military commitment. The movement of armies and weapons around Europe has financial and political costs, none of which can be

predicted with any certainty today. The Senate has no idea whether NATO expansion will cost \$1.5 billion, as the Pentagon predicts, or \$125 billion, the price once cited by the Congressional Budget Office. Nor does it know how much of that burden Washington will have to bear.

The White House has provided no military rationale for expanding NATO eastward while Europe is at peace and democracy and free markets are taking root in Russia. Instead, the ratification resolution promiscuously opens the door to NATO military actions almost anywhere in the world. That startling expansion of NATO's license to conduct military operations demands extensive debate.

Astonishingly, the Senate is being asked to approve all this without even the most basic analysis of potential threats in Europe or a description of how expansion is likely to affect American military forces. That information should have been the subject of intensive review by the Senate Armed Services Committee, but was not. It is to be provided by President Clinton no later than 180 days after the Senate votes. That is no way to run a government.

Mr. Lott may be content to tell his constituents that he approved NATO expansion after a few hours of perfunctory debate without knowing the cost or the military and political implications, but other senators ought to take their obligations and the nation's security more seriously. The matter should be referred back to the Foreign Relations and Armed Services committees for the careful analysis it should have received in the first place.

Washington Times

April 24, 1998

Pg. 20

Time to vote on NATO

The Senate will, at last, take up the debate over NATO enlargement next week, with a view to voting Wednesday or Thursday on the admission of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the Atlantic Alliance. No time like the present.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott delayed the vote once to accommodate the concerns of those among his colleagues who had come late to the discussion of the subject, which has been thoroughly aired over the past couple years in the journals and magazines, on Op-Ed pages, at conferences and in a series of hearings conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In truth, the quality of public discourse has not exactly benefited from the delay. The small number of opponents of enlargement, unable to attract many followers to a cause that would turn U.S. policy towards Europe topsy-turvy, seem to have become increasingly shrill as the clock ticks on toward ratification. In response to the increasingly hysterical attack on enlargement, some supporters of expansion have gone a bit over the top themselves. In the end, the Senate is going to vote overwhelmingly in favor of enlargement, and the sooner the better, lest too many people say things they are going to wish they could unsay once this is over.

For half a century, NATO has kept the peace in Europe by declaring that an attack on any of its members is an attack on all of its members. The most important corollary of that declaration has been the binding of the United States to Europe. By virtue of our engagement, we have secured Europe not only from external threat but also from the danger of internal divisions that have, twice this century, resulted in bloody war and required the deaths of many Americans to set right. NATO has expanded before, and it is appropriate that it expand again to welcome

new countries that can contribute to the security of all members.

Opponents note that the external threat to Europe isn't what it used to be. Thankfully, that's true. Supporters of NATO enlargement err in painting today's Russia as a threat on a par with the Soviet Union. That kind of alarmism is inappropriate — and you don't need the equivalent of a Soviet Union to make the case for an expanded NATO. The question for the United States, really, is the extension and deepening of U.S. ties to Europe. We offered many words of encouragement to the people trapped on the wrong side of the Iron Curtain during the Soviet period. Now that that era is over, we ought to be doing what we can to strengthen our bonds with nations telling us, now that they are free to do so, that they want to join with us.

Opponents worry that in embracing them, we antagonize Russia — perhaps paving the way for a return to Russian aggression and expansionism. It's true that NATO enlargement has few fans in Russia. On the other hand, the attention of the Russian people and their leadership seems mainly to be focused inward — and properly so, given the immense undertaking of digging out from under the wreckage of a century of communist misrule. NATO enlargement hardly hinders the Russians in that task. On the contrary, Western governments have been exceptionally attentive to Russia's needs since the breakup of the Soviet Union.

Treaty opponents now say that the Clinton administration is being high-handed — unwilling to entertain amendments to enlargement. The charge is off base; the problem is that the amendments don't stand up. Sen. John Warner would like to mandate a three-year pause before any further enlargement of NATO is considered. But why this arbitrary period? No one seems eager to jump to the next round of expansion the day after the first vote. Clearly, the tim-

ing of a second round depends on how the first round goes, who the second-round participants might be, etc. Those considerations are precisely not arbitrary, and they should govern.

Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan would like membership in the European Union to be a prerequisite for NATO expansion. But this essentially ignores the role the United States has long played in leading Europe. Waiting for Europe, as for example in the case of Bosnia, can be a mistake. It's now NATO enlargement that is leading EU expansion.

All of these arguments have been made and made again. The case for NATO enlargement simply makes more sense than the case against it. Let's vote.

European Stars & Stripes April 24, 1998 Pg. 2

CORRECTION

An editing error in Wednesday's edition caused some words in a story about NATO expansion to appear as a direct quote. They were not. The final paragraph of that story should read: "The world has changed," the spokesman said, and NATO

must change with it. After 49 years of keeping the peace in Europe, NATO must tackle new threats and new dangers. It can't do that by standing pat.

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 22, 1998, Pg. 2.

Chicago Tribune

April 23, 1998

Time To Advise, Consent On NATO

The Senate appeared poised last month to vote on--and approve--treaty amendments that would admit Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

But after a few days of desultory debate, Majority Leader Trent Lott abruptly pulled the issue from the Senate floor, ostensibly in anger over Democratic stalling on an education bill dear to the Republicans.

Now, after a cooling-off period, the Senate is expected to resume Thursday its consideration of NATO enlargement. And this time, petty partisan differences must not be allowed to derail the issue, one of the most momentous in U.S. foreign policy since the end of the Cold War.

The Senate should give the treaties the thorough debate they deserve--and then give them the two-thirds majority needed for approval.

For months now, supporters of NATO enlargement have felt privately that Senate approval was less a matter of if than of when. The smart money in Washington still says the amendments will be ratified by a comfortable margin. But then the smart money was saying a month ago that ratification would come before Easter.

In the weeks since Lott yanked the issue from the Senate floor, opponents of NATO enlargement have mounted an increasingly visible campaign of newspaper ads and television commercials, most of them focusing on the danger of antagonizing Russia and retarding democratic development there by giving rabid nationalists an issue to flog.

That is not a negligible concern. Indeed, it is one we also have shared. However, we have concluded that, on balance, the arguments in favor of enlargement are more persuasive. Adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO--and leaving open the possibility of additional new members later--takes those countries out of geopolitical play between Russia and the West. As members of NATO, they become securely part of the West, able to pursue prosperity amid the peace, freedom and stability that NATO has wrought in Europe over the last half century.

To be sure, a NATO commitment is no small thing: It means one for all and all for one. But the strength of NATO--and the likely reason it never has been forced to fight a war--is the resoluteness of that commitment on all sides.

Let the Senate fulfill its duty to advise, through a focused, sensible debate, and consent, with the requisite 67 votes. Then let NATO enlargement proceed.

Washington Times

April 24, 1998

Pg. 19

Military tailspin over sexual politics

PAUL CRAIG ROBERTS

In Ayn Rand's classic novel, "Atlas Shrugged," productive people walk away when government policies become overbearing. This is now happening in the U.S. military. The best pilots are leaving in droves despite a doubling of the bonus for signing on for another five years.

Two years ago, six out of 10 Air Force pilots took the \$60,000 bonus and stayed. Today, not even three out of 10 will stay for twice the bonus. In the first five months of the 1998 fiscal year, the Air Force lost 775 pilots -- 23 percent more than it lost in all 12 months of 1997. With attrition rates outstripping replacements, the Air Force expects to be short about 1,000

pilots this year.

The situation is worse among Navy carrier pilots. The Associated Press reported that this year only 10 percent of the Navy's top flyers have accepted bonuses to stay.

The Navy Times conducted a survey to find out what was driving out the best fighter pilots. Among the top two reasons for leaving, 50 percent of Navy officers cited "loss of confidence with leadership." As one flight officer put it, "The current leaders of the Navy are now reaping the rewards of their politically centered shortsightedness."

Pilot morale has been destroyed by Navy admirals and Air Force generals who sold out their services for one more star on their

shoulder or sleeve. The trouble began with the Tailhook scandal that was orchestrated by radical feminist Pat Schroeder, a Democratic member of Congress at the time. The scandal was turned into a witch hunt by radical feminists and used to break down the Navy's opposition to placing women in combat. The admirals choose career over loyalty to the Navy and aligned themselves with the feminists' sexual politics.

Soon female quota pilots were flying F-14s with disastrous results. One was permitted to keep flying despite the warnings of her flight instructor that she was a danger to herself and others. She crashed and died. To hide the fact that the pilot was killed by the Navy's quota policy, Navy Secretary John Dalton put out a false report that the

mishap was caused by engine failure.

The Navy personnel aboard the aircraft carrier who witnessed the event saw more than the crash and death of a pilot. They saw the breakdown of military integrity under pressure to hastily acquire female jet fighter pilots.

When I wrote about this three years ago, Adm. S.R. Arthur wrote the Navy's obligatory cover-up letter-to-the-editor in response to my column, which he dismissed as "tripe." The Navy's pilots, of course, already knew the facts, and they saw Adm. Arthur's letter as more lies to cover up the Navy's double standards in flight training.

Since Adm. Arthur's cover-up letter, the facts have burst out all over the place. There has been a Navy report citing numerous pilot errors as the cause of the crash. The woman's flight instructor, Lt. Patrick J. Burns, a braver man than Adm. Arthur, released training

records that showed beyond any doubt that women were being pushed through F-14 qualification school irrespective of failures that would have washed a male out of flight school.

The Navy has had to ground other female fighter pilots that it once claimed were qualified, and Adm. Arthur himself has since admitted that the Navy may have pushed female fliers too quickly into combat squadrons.

Elaine Donnelly of the Center for Military Readiness issued a number of documented reports that show the destruction of pilot morale by sexual politics and the Clintonista service secretaries who have forced the dangerous double-standards into flight training. Integrity at the top is so perverted that Navy Secretary Dalton has attempted to deflect attention from his deadly quota policy by censuring Lt. Burns for telling the truth.

Demoralization has spread

beyond the pilots. Last year, only 30 percent of first-term sailors reenlisted. That is substantially below the retention rate necessary to maintain a steady-state force. Retention has also fallen below target levels for second- and third-term sailors. Indeed, the Navy Times reports that 75 percent of officers and enlisted personnel are "planning or leaning toward leaving the Navy."

The Republican Congress and armed services committees could stem the departure tide by washing John Dalton out of service, but Republicans are too cowardly to do anything that might appear manly. The next time President Clinton threatens to bomb Iraq, he will first have to borrow some pilots from our allies.

Paul Craig Roberts is a columnist for The Washington Times and is nationally syndicated.

New York Times

April 24, 1998

Should We Sell Supercomputers to Algeria?

By Gary Milhollin

WASHINGTON -- Since January, the Clinton Administration has been quietly circumventing a new law intended to keep American supercomputers away from third-world bomb and missile makers. Supercomputers are the most powerful tools available for designing nuclear weapons and the missiles to deliver them. The world may soon face more weapons of mass destruction, all so computer companies can reap a few export dollars.

The Digital Equipment Corporation has asked the Commerce Department for permission to sell a supercomputer to India's Nuclear Power Corporation, which runs a string of reactors, widely assumed to produce plutonium used in atomic bombs. Digital also wants to supply China's Harbin Institute of Technology, which makes rocket casings and other components for long-range missiles.

Sun Microsystems wants to outfit the Indian Institute of Technology, which develops rocket propellants and performs wind-tunnel research to improve the flight of nuclear missiles. And Silicon Graphics

Inc. is hoping to supply supercomputers to another company that develops India's biggest rocket and missile engines.

By law, American companies must notify the Government before shipping a supercomputer to countries like Russia and China, which don't control their exports effectively, and India, Israel and Pakistan, which reject the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. If a Federal agency objects to a sale within 10 days of notification, the seller must provide more information.

Congress passed legislation last fall after Silicon Graphics and I.B.M. were caught shipping supercomputers to Russia's leading nuclear-weapon labs without the required export licenses.

But in January, Gary Samore, the White House official in charge of nonproliferation and export controls, knocked the teeth out of the law. He informed the Federal agencies that they could not object to a sale unless an under secretary personally put the objection in writing. This is like requiring the Postmaster General to personally forward your mail.

A Pentagon expert told me

that this requirement is "outrageous," because even formal license applications, which are more important than notices, are handled by midlevel personnel. David Tarbell, a senior Pentagon official, complained in a memo that the White House seemed to want to "insure that no (or very few) objections would ever be received."

The Energy Department has not objected to a single sale, because staffers there believe they would not get an objection up their chain of command within 10 days.

Even Federal agencies that have persisted have been unsuccessful. In February, the American arm of Siemens, the German electronics giant, announced that it wanted to sell a powerful computer to the Russian Academy of Sciences. The Pentagon objected because the academy's institutes still design nuclear warheads and missiles. But the Commerce Department returned the objection because an under secretary hadn't signed it. The Russians got the machine, and the Pentagon got stiffed. Only the tiny Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been nimble

enough to lodge effective objections.

Most recently, the Commerce and Energy Departments are trying to drop more than 20 countries that are now covered by the law. They want to allow supercomputer exports to Algeria, a terrorist-plagued state that is planning to process plutonium.

The two departments also want to drop restrictions on countries like Vietnam and Vanuatu, which have no export controls, so technology could be easily diverted to other countries.

For all this, the computer companies would gain relatively little. The countries on the list of risky destinations account for only 5 percent of the potential market for supercomputers.

Is it worth the risk, if someday American soldiers and sailors face Russian- and Chinese-supplied missiles in the Persian Gulf? Unless the Clinton Administration follows the intent of the law, those missiles will be designed with American help.

Gary Milhollin directs the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control.

Fort Worth Star-Telegram April 22, 1998

Lockheed, Boeing Might Share Fighter Contract

By Michael D. Towle
Star-Telegram
Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON -- Lockheed Martin and Boeing have been competing fiercely to produce the nation's next generation of front-line fighters, but a congressional report suggests that both companies could end up with a piece of the lucrative contract.

In a 24-page report circulating among members of House and Senate defense committees, the Congressional Research Service says the losing contractor may have to be given a major stake in the winner's joint strike fighter program to retain competition in the industry.

The joint strike fighter program, intended to produce replacements for the Air Force F-16, Navy F-14 and Marine Corps AV-8B Harrier, is considered the Holy Grail among fighter makers. The contract, valued at \$250 billion for the winner, will be the last major one for a fighter plane for the next quarter-century, analysts say.

"The way we are approaching the competition at this point is that it is winner take all," said Joe Stout, a spokesman for Lockheed Martin in Fort Worth.

"At the same time, we're aware that there are many is-

sues in making this kind of an industry-based decision, and so we're certainly watching what signals come out that way."

The Congressional Research Service is part of the Library of Congress and regularly does research for congressional committees on key issues. Without making recommendations, the agency outlined for lawmakers a variety of issues surrounding the JSF program.

Some in the industry "fear that those firms selected as prime contractors for both development and production of the JSF will dominate the U.S. defense industry to such an extent that competition will be seriously impaired," the report says.

"Those concerns are increased by the continuing consolidation of U.S. aircraft and defense companies, highlighted in 1997 by Boeing's purchase of McDonnell Douglas and Lockheed Martin's proposed purchase of Northrop Grumman."

But the report also says that if losing contractors are given important roles in the program by the eventual winner, they could continue operations and compete for other weapons programs.

Such a scenario, the research service said, "would preserve some degree of competitiveness in development

and production of fighter aircraft."

Lockheed's corporate teammates on the program include Northrop Grumman and British Aerospace.

The Pentagon will tap Lockheed Martin or Boeing in 2001. Production is scheduled to begin about 2005. The JSF is expected to stay in production until 2020.

Industry analysts say heavy involvement by the losing contractor would boost its political appeal in Congress.

"I think it is almost inevitable that both will have a stake," said Liesl Heeter, a defense budget analyst with the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, a Washington think tank.

"If you are really concerned about competition in the industry, you will want to maintain both organizations, and I think that politically there will be more support for the program. It gives it a broader constituency."

The program is expected to mean production of 1,763 fighters for the Air Force, 609 for the Marine Corps, 480 for the Navy and 60 for the British Royal Navy. Some analysts estimate that the plane's international sales may top 2,000 aircraft.

William Dane, an industry analyst at Forecast International, a Newtown, Conn., company that studies the industry, said Congress may reconsider the current plan of producing every JSF aircraft off one production line.

"It may be better for all concerned if all the eggs were not in one basket," he said.

"On the F-16 program, two different companies -- General Electric and Pratt & Whitney -- compete to produce the engines. It holds their feet to the fire, gets the government a better deal, and inspires the companies to come up with further improvements in reliability and available power in their respective engines."

The research service report was completed in March, but it has only begun to gain attention on Capitol Hill because Congress has just returned from its spring recess.

Last year, Rep. Bill Young, R-Fla., chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on defense, said the Pentagon should look at alternative production plans for the aircraft and questioned the need to produce them all in one place.

The report is making the rounds just as Lockheed Martin has begun assembly of the first of two JSF prototypes. Production of the Lockheed aircraft, dubbed the X-35, began this week at the company's Skunk Works facility in Palmdale, Calif. Lockheed Tactical Aircraft Systems in Fort Worth directs the company's JSF program.

Lockheed said the first X-35 will demonstrate its design for the F-16 replacement for the Air Force, the so-called conventional variant.

"Our aircraft is taking shape," Skunk Works Product Manager Rick Baker said. "Now we can watch the next-generation strike fighter grow step by step as we move toward rollout and flight test."

London Daily Telegraph

April 24, 1998

Clinton 'not pulling his weight' in global crises

By Christopher Lockwood,
Diplomatic Editor

THE Clinton administration is failing to display the vision and leadership required from the only country capable of resolving the world's great crises, an influential report claims.

The main international dramas of the last year - Asia's financial meltdown and the

confrontation with Saddam Hussein - underlined how America's reaction invariably shapes that of the world to great events, said the International Institute of Strategic Studies, the leading foreign affairs think-tank. But it said that American power is at all times constrained by the needs of domestic politics.

The IISS's annual review of

the globe's political health, Strategic Survey 1997/8 said: "Its reactions are sometimes late because it is slow to recognise the strength of a developing crisis and slow also to decide how heavily United States national interests are engaged."

The IISS's director, Dr John Chipman, said: "The United States remains the determinant force in international politics, but it is often late into crisis management, and continues to oscillate unpredictably between unilateral and multilateral approaches to international prob-

lems."

This is in part due to America's love-hate relationship with multilateral organisations like the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund. Dr Chipman said: "The United States was largely responsible for founding them at the end of the Second World War, but wide swathes of American political opinion have come to distrust them as obstacles to America's freedom of action, or for dragging it into conflicts for which it has no appetite."

The report singles out America's track record on

handling the Middle East peace process. Largely because of the power of the Jewish lobby in Congress, the Clinton administration has shown itself incapable of applying sufficient pressure on the government of Benjamin Netanyahu, it says.

Washington Post
April 24, 1998 Pg. 28

China, Taiwan Reopen Talks, Agree on High-Level Visits

By Steven Mufson
Washington Post
Foreign Service

BEIJING, April 23—China and Taiwan reopened talks after a three-year hiatus and agreed that Taiwan's top negotiator, Koo Chen-fu, would visit the mainland before the end of this year.

Jan Jyh-hong, head of the delegation from Taipei's semi-official Straits Exchange Foun-

dation, told Reuters news agency that Beijing had agreed that the foundation's head, Koo, could visit this year. Jan also said that Tang Shubei, vice chairman of China's semi-official Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait, had accepted an invitation to visit Taiwan.

"The time is now ripe for both sides of the straits to conduct political talks under the 'one China' principle," Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Zhu Bangzao said today at a regular news briefing. Zhu said Beijing would welcome more exchanges with Taipei.

Today's talks were the first since China broke off contacts after Taiwanese President Lee Teng-hui visited the United States in March 1995. Lee called it a private trip to a class reunion at Cornell University, but Beijing viewed the visit as an effort to break Taiwan's diplomatic isolation and upgrade Taiwan's relations with the United States. Those relations were downgraded in the 1970s when the United States reestablished relations with

Beijing.

The talks today were also the latest in a series of developments that have reduced tensions across the Taiwan Strait, where two years ago last month China held a series of threatening military exercises and missile tests just off Taiwan's coast. Though Chinese leaders believe they will be unable to come to any political agreement as long as Lee is in power, they want to reduce tensions and start to lay the groundwork for talks with other Taiwanese leaders.

Taiwan's Jan told reporters that he had held two rounds of talks with Li Yafei of China's Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait and had met for 30 minutes with Tang.

The two sides still are far apart on matters of substance, and talks are likely to drag on for years. Beijing has viewed Taiwan as a rebel province since Chinese Nationalist forces fled there in 1949 after losing the civil war on the mainland to the Communists. Democratic Taiwan, which has

been a self-governing island for nearly 50 years, is reluctant to give up its autonomy and reunite with the less developed and politically repressive mainland.

Taiwan wants talks now to focus on technical issues such as fishing rights, shipping and communication links, and normalizing investment status. Taiwanese companies have billions invested in China.

China, however, wants to hold political talks about how to bring about reunification under the "one-country, two systems" formula China applied to capitalist Hong Kong last year. Taiwanese leaders, backed by the majority of public opinion in polls, say they would not consider reunification until China adopts a market economy and democracy.

In a sign that mutual suspicions remain, even as the talks got under way, China's official New China news agency blasted Taiwan for its recent proposal to host a regional forum with Beijing to discuss solutions to Asia's economic woes.

European Stars & Stripes

April 24, 1998

Pg. 4

Quality of life overseas just doesn't measure up

By Cindy Elmore
Stuttgart bureau

STUTTGART, Germany — Almost no quality-of-life services on U.S. military bases in Europe measure up to what military families can find in the United States, analysts said this week. Out of 22 programs or services measured, chaplaincy programs were one of the few areas to rank near the top, according to about 40 military installation commanders from throughout Europe.

Other areas were viewed "to a moderate or significant degree below what we'd expect to see in the U.S.," said Jeffrey Fuller, senior policy analyst for the Anser Corp., a consulting company that surveyed the base commanders and met with them in focus groups at a quality-of-life conference.

The commanders were in Stuttgart to give their views on

the greatest quality-of-life needs in their communities. To no one's surprise, most want to see better base housing, medical facilities and child-care options, Fuller said. The conference was the first in Europe in which installation commanders from all services were asked to come together and give their views on quality of life. The results will help determine the funding requests that the European Command sends to Congress this fall.

The command is trying to make the case that quality-of-life issues affect troop readiness. Fuller gave an example. If, during a deployment, the family of a soldier, airman or sailor "can't be taken care of because they have to drive 100 miles to a commissary, or if they have to wait to get a medical appointment, or if they can't get a dental appointment," then the servicemember

cannot fully focus on his or her military mission, Fuller said.

Anser is trying to help the command link troop readiness and quality-of-life issues.

"I think EUCOM has been kind of held hostage by the uncertainty (of the mission) since the Cold War," Fuller said. With that uncertainty comes a reluctance to build everything that is needed to take care of servicemembers and families living overseas, he said. Military spouses might be surveyed next, Fuller said.

"The thing that's very nice about this conference is that EUCOM is dealing with our issues — because out here, the problems are different," said Capt. Don Mosser, the executive officer for Naval Air Station Sigonella, Sicily. Most such quality-of-life conferences focus on programs and services in the United States, he said.

Mosser said he and others stressed the need for more spouse employment opportunities overseas. Carolyn Becraft, deputy assistant secretary of defense for personnel support, families and education, said the

military must make a concerted effort to educate Congress on the needs in Europe. However, she added that Europe has "held its own" in the funding flow, even while completing the drawdown and stabilizing its military communities.

In her keynote address to the conference Thursday night, Becraft said the military needs to adjust if it wants to keep the so-called "Generation X" — those born between 1963 and 1977. That group makes up by far the bulk of today's servicemembers, but the troops have different expectations from their older counterparts, Becraft said.

Generation X-ers want the opportunity to learn skills that will help them on the next job. They want rapid feed-back and constant markings of recognition for their hard work — "so they can measure the return on their investment."

And, they rely on their own skills and abilities to achieve security, she said. About 25 percent of servicemembers are 25 or younger.

Shipbreaking scandal takes a new turn

■ **Navy surplus: Panel upholds scrapping system that kills people.**

IN THE WAKE of crimes and penalties for injuries and pollution in breaking up the Navy's proud old ships, a panel representing seven federal agencies recommended keeping the system that kills workers and dumps asbestos and PCBs in coastal waters.

Just let the fly-by-night contractors achieve economies by buying several ships at a time to break up and sell for scrap at a profit, the panel said.

It also recommended more inspections for occupational safety and environmental protection, and weeding out the worst offenders.

Worst of all, the panel recommended retaining the option of

selling old Navy and merchant ships abroad, to Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi operators who break them up on the beaches with no safety or environmental scruples. Export the water poisoning and worker deaths to the Third World, where profit margins are higher.

This panel, chaired by Patricia A. Rivers of the Defense Department, was a pathetic response to the scandal revealed by a *Sun* investigation into shipbreaking practices last year.

Reporters Gary Cohn and Will Englund won the Pulitzer Prize for investigative reporting, among other journalistic honors, for their effort.

The Pentagon understands that it must spend money to close bases safely, leaving the land as as-

sets for their communities. To win approval of two more rounds, it promises very careful measures. But the same Pentagon fails to understand that this may also apply when mighty ships have outlived their usefulness to national security.

The report has already met skepticism in Congress from Sen. Barbara A. Mikulski, D-Md., Rep. George Miller, D-Calif., and Rep. Wayne T. Gilchrest, R-Md., who promised to call another hearing on the program before his House maritime subcommittee. They should keep up the pressure.

There may be differences of opinion on the extent to which the U.S. government should police occupational and environmental safety. But it has no business being a flagrant offender.

To farm the ships out for scrapping under conditions that legitimate businesses avoid makes recurrence inevitable.

Government does not shed its responsibility by looking the other way. Nor can it fulfill that responsibility by promising to peek once in a while.

Hide And Not Seek

France has little wish to see Karadzic captured

London Times

April 24, 1998

The fragile peace that constitutes the Bosnian political settlement will not grow stronger until the demons of a desperate past have been exorcised. The full truth must be told and full justice dispensed through the International War Crimes Tribunal. The most important suspects remain Radovan Karadzic and General Ratko Mladic. The failure to apprehend either man so far has been a source of considerable embarrassment. It now seems that the reason for this failure rests as much with Paris as Pale.

The Washington Post revealed yesterday that Anglo-American plans to snatch Dr Karadzic had been heavily compromised by the actions of a senior French military official, Major Hervé Gourmelon, who held a series of clandestine meetings with the former Serb leader throughout 1997. This persuaded Washington that Dr Karadzic was too well informed of Nato intentions and intelligence to be easily captured.

The French have conceded that Major Gourmelon had numerous contacts with Dr Karadzic. These were clearly not the result of unilateral diplomacy but were reported back to his superiors. When this relationship became "apparently questionable", according to the French Defence Ministry, the officer was redeployed to Paris. The strong suspicion must be that this line of private communication was ended abruptly only because either the United States or Britain became aware of it.

If such duplicity is disappointing, it is not surprising. From the start of the Balkan conflicts, France has played an ambiguous role. It was best symbolised by the actions of General Bernard Janvier, the then overall UN Force Commander in Bosnia. When Sarajevo suffered intense shelling from the Serbs in May 1995, General Janvier refused to authorise airstrikes because this might "invite retaliation". When the Serbs seized UN peacekeepers, the General would not sanction the use of armoured fighting vehicles because that would violate "strict peacekeeping principles". Throughout these episodes, General Janvier held secret conclaves involving General Mladic. Major Gourmelon seems to have followed a long and dishonourable tradition.

If French obstructionism has been well-established, another question becomes relevant. Why has the American press now received, via a well-directed leak, this belated information? The best explanation is that the State Department would still like to see Dr Karadzic indicted and believes that an arrest is quite feasible. This, however, would require at least the passive co-operation of the French who are the dominant outside force in the area around Pale. American must still fear that Paris continues to prefer Dr Karadzic hidden rather than in The Hague. That would be a betrayal of Bosnia. On this occasion, France must realise that *laissez faire* is not an option.

Shameful, Not Questionable

Washington Post
April 24, 1998
Pg. 26

As long as the war criminals of Bosnia roam free, recovery for that wounded nation will not be possible. Many men who led campaigns of ethnic cleansing, mass rape and torture remain at large, a constant impediment to those Serbs, Croats and Bosnians who now are working toward democracy and tolerance. The greatest single impediment to peace remains Radovan Karadzic, the former Bosnian Serb president who allegedly ordered or acquiesced in some of the worst atrocities of the 1992-95 war.

So news of possible French collaboration with Mr. Karadzic in his efforts to evade capture and trial by an international war crimes tribunal can only provoke revulsion. According to a story by R. Jeffrey Smith in *The Post* yesterday, NATO troops in Bosnia had to abandon a plan to seize the constantly guarded former leader after learning that a French officer had been meeting with him on a regular basis and passing information to him about NATO operations. Nor was this a rogue activity; the officer kept his superiors informed about his meetings with Mr. Karadzic.

Although French officials initially told NATO colleagues that they would court-martial the officer, they now apparently have no plans to punish him.

The French government yesterday issued a terse statement that raised more questions than it answered. The officer in question, it said, did not compromise NATO arrest plans. He was pursuing contacts according to his orders, France said, but as soon as those contacts "could have appeared questionable" he was withdrawn to France. Seemed questionable? For starters, NATO policy forbids any contact with indicted war criminals. The entire NATO contingent, including its U.S. component, has been too hesitant in pursuing alleged war criminals. But in recent months, U.S., Dutch and British forces have recorded some significant successes -- and none of their forces could be accused of actively helping war criminals escape. The French government needs to explain exactly what policy it has been pursuing.

Riverside (CA) Press-Enterprise

April 22, 1998

Pg. 14

Playing The War-Surplus Game

Two years and three months after closing, it turns out, the old hospital at the former March Air Force Base is still sitting full of expensive, useful equipment. There is no inventory with a price tag on the bottom line, apparently, but since one of the items is a nearly new magnetic resonance imaging machine worth some \$750,000, this could well be a multimillion dollar waste.

No one has been doing anything effectual about it, and what's more, outside of Rep. Ken Calvert, R-Corona, who wants a House government operations subcommittee to examine the issue, it appears nothing is planned. So there the stuff is going to sit for the foreseeable future.

That is patently ridiculous.

The materiel left sitting inside the hospital, pretty much right where it sat, isn't just medical machinery with a limited use, though there are X-ray machines and all the other trappings of an ER. It's adjustable beds, desks and chairs; it's computers and electric typewriters and TVs, and much more. The recent opening of the nearby Riverside County Regional Medical Center means there's no use for all this right where it is, but it could be put to use in the community, or it could be sold. Letting it rot

really shouldn't be an option.

It's said this has come about because the federal Base Realignment and Closure Act doesn't permit the necessary flexibility for dealing with leftovers. But the Soviet Union folded up shop the day after Christmas, 1991. We've been downsizing for six years. How long does it take to fix a problem like this, anyway?

In fact, the last time we downsized the U.S. military, a half-century ago, it gave rise to such stories, too. Like military procurement, war-surplus is a field with its own legends. One of the best concerns the pilot who, having wrecked the WW II surplus military plane he'd just bought, was told not to worry about it; to just take another and be on his way. It's an attitude.

Still, why should Congress have to pass a law to get the Pentagon to act responsibly? Especially after the president of the United States has promised that Washington would do everything possible to try to ease the pain of base closures? There's no good reason.

If Defense Secretary William Cohen really wants to push another round of base closures through Congress, as he says he does, Congress ought to tell him to go finish the other rounds in a proper manner first. There'll be time enough to talk about more once the Pentagon can show it's scrapped that old attitude for something more efficient.

Wall Street
Journal

April 24, 1998

Pg. B6

Lockheed Martin Taps Coffman as Chairman, Succeeding Augustine

By a WALL STREET JOURNAL Staff Reporter
BETHESDA, Md. -- Lockheed Martin Corp. said its chief executive officer, Vance D. Coffman, was named chairman. He succeeds Norman R. Augustine, who will remain a director.

The move, which was expected, was signaled last year when the 54-year-old Mr. Coffman was named chief executive, succeeding the 62-year-old Mr. Augustine. At the time, Mr. Augustine said he would be turning the chairman's duties over to Mr. Coffman as early as April 1998.

Mr. Augustine serves on several corporate boards and is on the faculty at Princeton University. Lockheed is a defense and information-systems company.

Minneapolis Star-Tribune
April 24, 1998

National Guard F-16 crashes; pilot dies

Associated Press

WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE, N.M. -- A New Mexico Air National Guard F-16C fighter plane crashed into rugged terrain during a training mission, killing the pilot, who had family in Minnesota.

Two other pilots flying in the same training exercise Wednesday night saw the crash

and a fireball.

The \$25 million, single-seat plane crashed about 15 miles west of Carrizozo. The body of Lt. Patrick Potter, 29, of Albuquerque, was recovered early Thursday. The cause of the crash was unknown.

Potter, who had about 350 hours of flying experience, was making a second bombing run when he crashed. He is survived by his wife, Robin, his parents and extended family in Minnesota.

Congress flies to exotic locales on wings of taxpayers

The Hill
April 22, 1998
Pg. 1

By Jock Friedly

Rep. Sonny Callahan (R-Ala.) capped off a European business trip last August by flying to Athens on a military plane for a three-day, taxpayer-financed sightseeing trip with several colleagues.

While in Greece, the delegation visited the sound and light show at the Acropolis, the Cycladic Art Museum, featuring an impressive collection of arts of antiquity, and the crumbling ruins of the temples of Athena and Poseidon on the picturesque Cape Sounion. They stayed at the Astir Palace, which is located on an 80-acre, pine-covered promontory outside of Athens and considered by some to be the nation's most luxurious resort.

Though the trip's ostensible purpose was to "investigate human rights," not a single matter of business was listed on the official itinerary on the Greek portion of the trip before they flew home. Although one participant recalled a meeting with the U.S. ambassador to Greece, he couldn't say when that occurred.

An earlier leg of the trip involved a two-day stay in Istanbul. Although the participants had a one-hour session with the Greek Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomeos I and two others meetings, the itinerary was dominated by a cruise on the Bosphorus Strait and sightseeing at the Aya Sofia, Topkapi Palace, Blue Mosque and Roman Cisterns, among other places.

Participants on the trip included Sandie and Joe Knollenberg (R-Mich.), Steven and Nita Lowey (D-N.Y.), Glenda and Dan Miller (R-Fla.), Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-N.J.), Callahan aide Charles Flickner, and Democratic aide Mark Murray. Rep. Mac Collins (R-Fla.) and his wife Julie were supposed to go to Greece as well, but due to a family emer-

gency, flew home at their own expense before the others made it to Athens.

No member who went to Greece agreed to be interviewed, but a Callahan aide justified it as compensation for official committee business they had just conducted in Georgia and Azerbaijan. "It's human relations," Flickner said. "To get members to go to unpleasant places, you go to pleasant

FLYING/HIGH



Second of three articles

places."

It was an expensive human relations move. At \$3,000 an hour for use of a National Guard C-22 transport plane, the flight to Athens from Tblisi, Ga., was at least \$7,500. Per diems for hotel and meal expenses, as well as \$100 in baggage tips, added at least another \$5,000 to the bill in Greece.

Codel Callahan, as this congressional delegation was known, highlights the lack of accountability in the congressional use of military transport planes for both overseas and domestic travel. Executive branch officials would have been strictly verboten from taking the Greek portion of the trip because of its lack of official business purpose.

A review of Pentagon records supporting hundreds of codels aboard military aircraft shows that most trips involve considerable business at a sometimes-frenetic pace. Every available itinerary reviewed — including Callahan's — listed meetings with heads of state, opposition leaders, peace negotiators, aid coordinators, trade ministers, military leaders, rank-and-file troops or others whose concerns could only be shared effectively through face-to-face meetings in foreign lands.

But some of the trips also leave opportunities for extracurricular activities.

On the way back from Thailand,

Vietnam and Australia to investigate U.S. national security interests, Rep. Floyd Spence (R-S.C.) and a delegation of five members and their spouses stopped in Honolulu for two days, longer than needed to give the military aircraft's flight crew its mandatory 15-hour rest and to receive the standard debriefing by officials of the Pacific Command.

Golf may have been a contributing factor in the delay, which cost taxpayers hundreds of dollars, and put a \$65 million plane out of service for 24 more hours during its peak season of use. Expense records from the hotel where they stayed indicate that one member of the delegation phoned a golf course overlooking the Pacific surf. A committee spokesman did not return a phone call seeking comment.

Legislators have no requirement to formally account for the official business they accomplished while spending vast sums of taxpayer money to fly to far-away parts of the globe. A few committees do produce reports on their trips. Even when these reports are made, though, taxpayers can't always be sure how much value they received from their legislators.

The House Agriculture Committee, for example, used military aircraft on a trip to Mexico last April. A 2,400-word report later prepared by the committee listed what purported to be all relevant briefings, along with every official the committee members met. This report mentioned only meetings in Mexico City and Laredo, Texas.

That's not exactly how the trip progressed, however, according to Pentagon records. The committee's plane also stopped for a full day and night in San Luis Potosi, a four-century-old city which happens to be a tourist attraction.

Aides to members who went say that the purpose of the San Luis Potosi trip was to investigate a livestock farm, but they could not provide details. In any case, Agriculture Committee members did not deem the stop worth mentioning, despite the \$4,600-an-hour cost of the C-20 plane they flew.

Some Pentagon-arranged congressional travel falls between official business and sightseeing. In November 1996, aides to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, for example, requested that the Army transport them by bus to Gettysburg, Pa., to tour the Civil War battlefield. The planners justified it by citing their desire to understand in historical context the military's current needs for

battlefield intelligence gadgetry.

At first, congressional liaison officials for the Army debated whether it was ethical to fulfill the request, ultimately deciding that it was of educational value. A committee staffer Art Grant, a historian who gave similar tours for Army War College students, narrated the tour.

Although Pentagon records do not mention reimbursement, congressional aide Charlie Battaglia, an organizer, said he recalls having each participant chip in \$20 or \$25 to help defray the costs. Army officials liked the idea so much that they invited dozens of aides to the Antietam battlefield in Maryland last May. Including breakfast, a picnic lunch and a 47-seat bus, that trip for 24 aides cost taxpayers \$1,538 in identifiable costs, not to mention the considerable staff time devoted to arranging the trip.

On foreign trips, Pentagon and State Department officials often are pressed into arranging sightseeing and shopping trips for congressional spouses.

When Callahan's group stopped in Ankara, Turkey, as the members of Congress met with the prime minister and others, the official itinerary for the "spouse program" said, "Continue cultural site visits, including Bazaar." In Georgia, as spouses were meeting with President Eduard Shevardnadze, the spouses were sipping cocktails and receiving a Georgia "history/culture briefing with Dr. Alex Rondelli and Dr. Revaz Gachechiladze."

The next day, as the itinerary called for a congressional side trip to Armenia, the spouse program involved a "day tour of Tblisi." The day after that, while members of Congress made a day trip to Azerbaijan to investigate the human rights problems there, the spouses stayed behind to make a "tour of Meksheta/Djvari." Georgian legend has it that buried at Meksheta is a tunic worn by Jesus Christ around the time of his crucifixion.

In and of itself, spousal travel on such trips is a special privilege. Pentagon travel regulations specify that spouses of military officials are not allowed to fly aboard military transport planes, unless there is an overriding national concern. Usually, that applies only in cases where international protocol requires a spouse's presence at a state dinner or a similar function, and only upon approval of top

Pentagon officials. In practice, executive branch spousal travel is very rare.

Pentagon regulations dealing with congressional travel make clear that the prohibition against dependent travel "is equally applicable to travel of dependents of members and employees of the Congress." It allows the travel "when essential to the proper accomplishment of the mission, desirable because of diplomatic or public relations, or necessary for the health of the individuals involved." Nevertheless, spousal travel on overseas code is the rule, not the exception.

Though "reasons of protocol" is often used as justification by legislators who want their spouses to travel, no records reviewed provide any specific instances in which spousal absence would be diplomatically awkward.

Indeed, many such trips are to other parts of this country, not foreign lands. Members of the Resources Committee, for example, took their spouses along to Puerto Rico when Rep. Don Young (R-Alaska) held hearings there last April on the subject of statehood. His Senate counterpart, Frank Murkowski (R-Alaska), and four Senate colleagues invited spouses along for a tour of his home state flown on a military transport plane.

On a trip to Singapore, Beijing and Hong Kong, Rep. Jennifer Dunn (R-Wash.) took the protocol custom one step further. The divorcee had her adult son, Reagan, join her. Had any of the four family members of various members of Congress paid their proportional share of the estimated air fare on that trip, their Asian vacation would have exceeded \$25,000 apiece.

One senior Senate aide who has traveled extensively over the years said spouses are rarely required for protocol reasons. "That's a lot of crap," he said. "Let's face it. They're out shopping." He predicted that if spouses needed justification to go, "you'll see a lot of these flights stopped."

Many observers said the stakes are too high for Congress to curb foreign trips, even if there are abuses. Dick Capen saw congressional travel from two unique positions: first, in the early 1970s, as deputy assistant secretary of defense for con-

gressional liaison, and later, during the Bush administration, as ambassador to Spain.

He said he saw "many examples of congressional travel that is marginal, at best." But then again, "I'm a big believer in the use of congressionals to understand some of the issues. We have a whole generation of members of Congress who do not have a strong background in foreign affairs."

Rep. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), a two-term member on the International Relations and National Security committees, knows firsthand what Capen meant. "I've been hard on Congress spending money," the reformer said. "Don't spend money if you don't have to."

As for overseas travel, Graham is a true believer in its benefit. Realizing "how little I understood the politics of that region," Graham went to Indonesia last year on a taxpayer-financed trip. Within hours of his arrival, the monetary system collapsed.

Now, back in Washington, he will oppose an International Monetary Fund bailout of the country, having learned from American business leaders there how much of their money was required to go to President Suharto's relatives. "Part of our business is to make public policy," he said. "If we're going to vote on an \$18 billion bailout of Indonesia, we better get over there and figure out what's going on."

Rep. Tillie Fowler (R-Fla.), a member of the National Security Committee, recalls when she first came to Congress in 1993, "I didn't take any trips in the 103rd Congress." Then a senior Democrat approached her with some bipartisan advice. She was a good committee member, he assured her, but "you're not going to be a great one unless you go meeting with our troops and go around the world."

And, she concluded, "That was the best advice I ever got."

Next: Pampering is often the rule with congressional travel.

Editor's Note: Part 1 of this series appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 17, 1998, Pg. 12.

Washington Post

April 24, 1998

Pg. C3

Female Police Officer Alleges Unfair Discipline

The Pentagon police officer who was the first to open fire at four unarmed teenagers who had been stopped in a stolen minivan has filed a sex-discrimination suit, contending that she is the only officer to be disciplined in connection with the incident.

In a complaint filed in U.S. District Court in Alexandria, Adrian Bess alleges that she was reassigned from traffic duty to operations and that she no longer carries a gun. The six other officers who fired

their guns at the minivan have received letters clearing them in the January incident, in which two of the teenagers were critically wounded, but Bess has not, according to the complaint filed Tuesday. No charges have been brought against the officers as a result of the incident, which was investigated by the FBI.

Bess, of Clinton, says she has been singled out and harassed by male officers in the traffic division of the Defense Protective Service.

A Pentagon spokesman said he could not comment on pending litigation or personnel matters such as disciplinary records.

In defense of congressional travel

Pentagon Perspective

By David Silverberg

Anyone who has traveled on business knows its sinful pleasures. There's the surcease from the daily demands of the office, the mixture of business and pleasure, the chance to cavort free from the overview of superiors, family or colleagues, the taste (sometimes) of luxury accommodations. And then, as one very high level official once told me after he had taken office: "Now I know why these guys like travel so much — it's the only time you get a chance to think!"

It's with this jaundiced eye that congressional travel is viewed by the public and the press. We all know what members of Congress do on travel, wink, wink. Add to that the fact that congressional travel takes place with taxpayer money and congressional delegations utilize all the perks of office, often imposing themselves on American embassies abroad, making outrageous demands, bringing along family and camp followers and spending hours shopping.

It all makes congressional travel an extremely inviting target for the press. It's actually not that hard to come up with outrageous figures for congressional travel, or ridiculous practices that add taxpayer costs.

Let's name names: The Hill is currently in the midst of exposing expensive congressional use of military transportation. Over at The Washington Post, Al Kamen, author of the column "In The Loop", has never met a congressional trip he's liked.

Legions of home-town reporters scrutinizing their members' travel practices are always ready to pounce on transgressions real or imagined — as are political challengers, current or potential. And let us not forget that candidate Bill Clinton successfully lacerated President George Bush for his heavy travel schedule and preoccupation with world affairs.

The cumulative effect of all this is to create enormous pressure against congressional travel, to keep members home where, presumably, they will be busily working at the real business of government. Any member who travels knows he will be a target just as surely as if he were in the sights of a Stinger missile.

But let me argue that members should travel and that this constant pressure is not good for members, the Congress or the country.

Part of the problem is that while the cost of congressional

travel is quantifiable, its benefits are intangible.

What is the quantifiable benefit in goodwill of a member showing up in a remote, Third-World village and leaving a legacy of American care and interest? What's the quantifiable benefit of a member appearing at a foreign trade show to promote American products? What's the quantifiable benefit of a member going to see how U.S. aid money is spent? What's the quantifiable benefit of a member developing a relationship with a foreign leader or an official who will one day become president of his country?

How much was it worth to have then-Rep. Bill Richardson in North Korea and able to rescue a downed American helicopter pilot? Or for the late Rep. Leo Ryan (D-Calif.) to go to Jonestown, Guyana, to save a constituent from a deadly cult? Or for the late Rep. Mickey Leland (D-Okla.) to try to bring famine relief to starving Africans? That was all congressional travel too.

But most of all, how does one quantify the benefit of having members of Congress who are familiar with the world, who have met foreign leaders and who can then return to Congress and make intelligent policy?

What does all this have to do with defense? Most congressional travel outside U.S. borders is related to foreign affairs and defense. But it's also in this area that an informed, experienced Congress is most critical because when the nation's policymakers blunder in defense or diplomacy, wars happen and lives are lost. There is no way to quantify the value of a member seeing a country with his own eyes and talking to its leaders — and dissidents — and then bringing that knowledge and experience back to the floor of the United States Capitol.

There will always be abuse of travel, whether in private or public life. It will always seem too expensive, and there will always be plenty of frivolity and waste and horror stories. But I'd be willing to put up with that on the part of Congress in order to also get the simple benefit of a Congress that knows what it's doing when it legislates defense, trade and foreign affairs.

The alternative — and the result that we're heading toward — is a Congress that is ignorant, insular and isolated.

And that's of no particular benefit to anyone.

David Silverberg is president of Silverberg Independent Media. He can be reached at SilMedia@erols.com.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)